



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/603,562

06/24/2003

Branislav N. Meandzija

15685P207

5500

45222

7590

05/03/2006

ARRAYCOMM/BLAKELY
12400 WILSHIRE BLVD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

ARANI, TAGHI T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/603,562

Applicant(s)

MEANDZIJA ET AL.

Examiner

Taghi T. Arani

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Taghi T. Arani
Primary Examiner
Aug 13
Taghi T. Arani
4/12/06

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-33 have been examined and are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13, 18, 23-25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent 6,189,098 to Kaliski, Jr.

As per claims 1, 7 and 23, Kaliski, Jr. teaches a method and a machine-readable medium storing instructions that, when performed by a user terminal of a wireless access network, the method (operations) comprising (Abstract, Fig. 1, Fig. 3A and associated texts)):

scrambling a user terminal certificate using a shared secret to be known only by the user terminal and an access point of the wireless access network (col. 4, lines 39-55, where the client's certificate (CERT-C) is retrieved from memory, EPROM 3, encrypted (scrambled) with the secret session key KSS (shared secret key); and

sending a message to the access point, the message including the scrambled user terminal certificate (col. 4, lines 53-55, message {CERT-TC}KSS is sent to server at 108 (access point).

As per claims 2, 8 and 24, Kaliski, Jr. teach the method, the machine-readable medium and user terminal of claims 1, 7 and 23 respectively, further comprising generating the shared secret and providing the shared secret to the access point (col. 4, lines 43-46, the client also generates a random secret session key (KSS) employing a number generator).

As per claims 3, 9 and 25, Kaliski, Jr. teaches the method of claims 1, 7 and 23 respectively, wherein providing the shared secret to the access point comprises the message further including the shared secret encrypted with an access point public key (col. 4, lines 46-51, a time-varying TS and the secret session key KSS are concatenated and the result is encrypted with the server's public key PUBserv and the encrypted message is sent to the server).

As per claims 13, 18 and 29, Kaliski, Jr. teaches a method, a machine-readable medium performed by an access point of a wireless access network, the method (operations) comprising (Figs. 2 and 3B and associated texts):

receiving a message from a user terminal of the wireless access network, the message containing a shared secret encrypted with an access point public key, and a user terminal certificate scrambled using the shared secret (col. 4, lines 56-57);

decrypting the shared secret using an access point private key; and

unscrambling the user terminal certificate using the decrypted shared secret (col. 4, lines 58 through col. 5, lines 11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 4, 10, 26, 14, 19 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaliski, Jr. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Persson et al., US patent 6,754,824 (hereinafter "Person").

As per claims 4, 10 and 26, Kaliski teach the method, the user terminal and the machine-readable medium of claims 1, 7 and 23 respectively, except wherein scrambling the user terminal certificate using the shared secret comprises combining the user terminal certificate with a pseudo-random sequence generated by a linear feedback shift register initialized with a part of the shared secret.

However, in an analogous art, Persson is directed to telecommunications systems and methods wherein the identity of the transmitting node is verified by modulating the CRC code utilizing a sequence known only to the participating parties. The modified CRC is generated by both the transmitting node and the receiving node initializing a LFSR register by a common key known only to the participating nodes (i.e. a pseudo-random sequence generated by a linear feedback shift register initialized with a part of the shared secrete [Persson, col. 2, lines 5-23]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Persson within the method and system of Kaliski for combining Kaliski's certificate with a pseudo-random sequence generated by a linear feedback shift register initialized with a part of the shared secret in order to verify both the authenticity of the received certificate and the identity of transmitting node and to deter unauthorized party to replace the participating nodes if week encryption or no encryption is switched on after authentication (Persson, col. 1, lines 35-49).

As per claims 14, 19 and 30, while Kaliski teaches unscrambling the user terminal certificate using the decrypted shared secrete (col. 4, line 659 through col. 5, line 1), Kaliski does not teach wherein unscrambling the user terminal certificate using the shared secret comprises combining the scrambled user terminal certificate with a pseudo-random sequence generated by a linear feedback shift register initialized with a part of the decrypted shared secret.

However, in an analogous art, Persson is directed to telecommunications systems and methods wherein the identity of the transmitting node is verified by modulating the CRC code utilizing a sequence known only to the participating parties. The modified CRC is generated by

both the transmitting node and the receiving node initializing a LFSR register corresponding to common key known only to the participating nodes (i.e. a pseudo-random sequence generated by a linear feedback shift register initialized with a part of the decrypted shared secret [Persson, col. 2, lines 5-23, see also col. 4, line 53 through col. 18]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Persson within the method and system of Kaliski for combining Kaliski's certificate with a pseudo-random sequence generated by a linear feedback shift register initialized with a part of the shared secret in order to verify both the authenticity of the received certificate and the identity of transmitting node and to deter unauthorized party to replace the participating nodes if weak encryption or no encryption is switched on after authentication (Persson, col. 1, lines 35-49).

4. Claims 17, 22 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaliski, Jr. and Persson as applied to claims 13 and 18, and further in view of US patent 6,886,095 to Hind et al. (hereinafter "Hind").

As per claims 17, 22 and 33, Kaliski does not teach but Hind teaches the user terminal certificate includes an identification of the user terminal and a user terminal public key which corresponds to a user terminal private key, wherein the user terminal certificate is used to authenticate the user terminal (Hind, col. 7, line 57 through col. 8, line 23, see also col. 6, lines 10-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kaliski's certificate with Hind's user terminal certificate containing identification of user terminal and a user terminal public key corresponding to a user terminal private key, wherein the user terminal

Art Unit: 2131

certificate is used to authenticate the user terminal with a motivation to couple Kaliski's certificate with both users of the terminal and the terminal in order to solve the prior art problems associated with users' certificates in enterprise situations where each application (user) as well as each device may require a different levels of security , requiring the ability to allow different levels of security accesses (Hind, col. 7, lines 12-24).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 5-6, 11-12, 15-16, 20-21, 27-28 and 31-32 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Prior arts made of record, not relied upon:

US 2001/0048744 to Kimura.

US 2002/0174335 to Zhang et al.

US 2003/0139180 to McIntosh et al.

US 2003/0084287 to Wang et al.

US 2004/0010713 to Vollbrecht et al.

2004/0098588 to Ohba et al.

US 6,870,930 to Kim et al.

US 6,996,714 to Halasz et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taghi T. Arani whose telephone number is (571) 272-3787. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 Mon-Fri.

Art Unit: 2131

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Taghi T. Arani, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2131
4/11/2006